



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,547	06/21/2001	Catherine G. Bala	FIS9-2000-0416	7268
29154	7590	03/01/2005	EXAMINER	
FREDERICK W. GIBB, III			LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE	
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2568-A RIVA ROAD			2161	
SUITE 304				
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401			DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/886,547	BALA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Etienne P LeRoux	2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13-21 and 23-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13-21 and 23-35 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Claim Status

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-21 and 23-35 are pending. Claims 4, 12 and 22 have been cancelled. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-21 and 23-35 are rejected as detailed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 8-11, 13, 16, 17, 19-21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 5,950,190 issued to Yeager et al (hereafter Yeager).

Claims 1, 10 and 19:

Yeager discloses:

- creating a query form in said client workstation [Fig 4];
- receiving a worksheet form in response to said query form, said worksheet form defining selected tabular data [col 9, lines 50-60, col 6, line 59 through col 7, line 2] wherein said worksheet grid form comprises multiple rows of data [Fig 4, 53]
- packaging said worksheet form to represent updated data for said tabular data

stream, wherein said packaging of said worksheet form includes editing results of said query form [Fig 7]

- saving changes of data contained in said worksheet form in a database of said server [col 12, lines 45-67]

Claims 2 and 20:

Yeager discloses wherein said creating of said query form creates secure complex queries based on a selection of table, columns, and constraints maintained in a database of said server computer [col 2, line 47 through col 3, lines 20]

Claims 3 and 21:

Yeager discloses wherein said receiving of said worksheet grid form creates a snapshot from data in a database of said server [col 4, lines 2-10]

Claims 8, 16 and 26:

Yeager discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes allowing only tables, rows, and columns to be updated by authorized users [col 12, lines 45-60].

Claims 9 and 17:

Examiner maintains that further including automatically maintaining a current level of implementation of said worksheet grid form on said client workstation is inherent in the teachings of Yeager.

Claim 11:

Yeager discloses updating said database through said network by transmitting said worksheet grid form from aid client computer to said server computer [Fig 2, 33, 34]

Claim 13:

Yeager discloses wherein said updating of said tabular data includes selecting tabular data summarized by selected groups [col 32-53]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of US Pat No 6,295,540 issued to Sanschagrin et al (hereafter Sanschagrin)

Claims 5, 13 and 23:

Yeager discloses the elements of claims 5, 10, 11 and 19 as noted above.

Yeager fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups.

Sanschagrin discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups [Fig 5]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Yeager per the above for the purpose of summarizing differences in data between different situations which have been investigated.

Claims 6, 14 and 24:

Yeager discloses the elements of claims 1, 10 and 19 as noted above.

Yeager fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables.

Sanschagrin discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables [col 7, lines 43-51].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables as taught by Sanschagrin.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Yeager per the above for the purpose of showing only discrepancies [col 7, line 47-51].

Claims 7, 15, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of Pub No US 2003/0023609 issued to Della-Libera et al (hereinafter Della-Libera).

Claims 7, 15 and 25 :

Yeager discloses the essential elements of claims 1, 10, 11 and 19 as noted above.

Yeager fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables.

Della-Libera discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables [paragraph 22].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables as taught by Della-Libera.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Yeager per the above for the purpose of merging and/or copying rows in a related table [paragraph 0064]

1. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of US Pat No 6,567,915 issued to Guthery (hereinafter Guthery).

Claim 18:

Yeager discloses the elements of claim 10 as noted above.

Yeager fails to disclose partitioning the database into private and public databases.

Guthery discloses partitioning the database into private and public databases [col 6, lines 44-50].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include partitioning the database into private and public databases as taught by Guthery.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Yeager per the above for the purpose of dividing the database into confidential and non-confidential user information [col 6, lines 44-46].

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of Pub No US 2002/0167543 issued to Smith et al (hereinafter Smith).

Claim 27:

Yeager discloses the elements of claim 19 as noted.

Yeager fails to disclose JAVA programming language.

Smith discloses JAVA programming language [paragraph 0040].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include JAVA programming language as taught by Smith.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Yeager per the above for the purpose of providing a platform independent language [paragraph 0040].

Claims 28, 29, 30, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of US Pat No 6,714,962 issued to Helland et al (hereafter Helland)

Claim 28:

Yeager discloses creating a query form in said client workstation receiving a worksheet grid form in response to said query form, said worksheet grid form defining selected tabular data, wherein said worksheet grids form comprises multiple rows of data, packaging said worksheet grid form to represent updated data for aid tabular data stream, wherein said packaging of said worksheet grid form includes editing results of said query form and saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server

Yeager discloses the essential elements of the invention as noted above but does not disclose applying commit rule options, during said saving of said changes of data contained in said worksheet grid, to choose a method by which errors are handled during the processing of database updates, deletes, and inserts. Helland discloses applying commit rule options, during said saving of said changes of data contained in said worksheet grid, to choose a method by which errors are handled during the processing of database updates, deletes, and inserts [col 11, line 54 – col 12, line 3 and col 13, lines 46-67]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include applying commit rule options, during said saving of said changes of data contained in said worksheet grid, to choose a method by which errors are handled during the processing of database updates, deletes, and inserts as taught by Helland for the purpose of ensuring that transactions occur in conformance with the ACID properties using the well known two-phase commit protocol, regardless of failures [col 11, lines 60-63]. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Yeager as noted such that a system service coordinates transactions that span multiple resource managers including where the resource managers reside on more than one server computer in a distributed network [col 11, lines 55-60].

Claim 29:

The combination of Yeager and Helland discloses the elements of claim 28 as noted above and furthermore, Yeager discloses wherein said creating of said query form creates secure complex queries based on a selection of table, columns, and constraints maintained in a database of said server computer [col 2, line 47 through col 3, lines 20]

Claim 30:

The combination of Yeager and Helland discloses the elements of claim 28 as noted above and furthermore, Yeager discloses wherein said receiving of said worksheet grid form creates a snapshot from data in a database of said server [col 4, lines 2-10]

Claim 34:

The combination of Yeager and Helland discloses the elements of claim 28 as noted above and furthermore, Yeager discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes allowing only tables, rows, and columns to be updated by authorized users [col 12, lines 45-60].

Claim 35:

The combination of Yeager and Helland discloses the elements of claim 28 as noted above and furthermore, examiner maintains that further including automatically maintaining a current level of implementation of said worksheet grid form on said client workstation is inherent in the teachings of Yeager.

Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Yeager and Helland and further in view of US Pat No 6,295,540 issued to Sanschagrin et al (hereafter Sanschagrin)

Claim 31:

The combination of Yeager and Helland discloses the elements of claim 28 as noted above, however the combination of Yeager and Helland fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups. Sanschagrin discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form

includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups [Fig 5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Yeager and Helland to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing reports capable of summarizing information by selected groups for the purpose of summarizing differences in data between different situations which have been investigated.

Claim 32:

The combination of Yeager and Helland discloses the elements of claim 28 as noted above, however, the combination of Yeager and Helland fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables. Sanschagrin discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables [col 7, lines 43-51]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes producing comparison reports on a delta between two similarly structured tables as taught by Sanschagrin. for the purpose of showing only discrepancies [col 7, line 47-51].

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Yeager and Helland in view of Pub No US 2003/0023609 issued to Della-Libera et al (hereinafter Della-Libera).

Claim 33:

The combination of Yeager and Helland discloses the elements of claim 28 as noted above, however the combination of Yeager and Helland fails to disclose wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables. Della-Libera discloses wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables [paragraph 22]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yeager to include wherein said packaging said worksheet grid form includes making cascaded mass changes to a set of related data across multiple tables as taught by Della-Libera for the purpose of merging and/or copying rows in a related table [paragraph 0064]

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/16/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states in the third paragraph of page 8 that Yeager does not disclose "wherein said worksheet grid form comprises multiple rows of data."

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Applicant is referred to Yeager's disclosure in column 10, lines 10-30 and Figures 1 and 4 which discloses "A separate input field 53 is positioned adjacent each parameter button 52 to allow a user to input corresponding search terms into one or more of

Art Unit: 2161

the blank fields 53 using one of the input devices 40 (Fig. 2)" Yeager's Figure 4, clearly shows that input grid 53 comprises multiple rows.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states in the third paragraph of page 8 that Yeager does not disclose "saving changes of data contained in said worksheet grid form in a database of said server."

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Applicant is referred to Yeager's disclosure in column 12, lines 60-65 which teaches that "Once the appropriate fields 83 have been edited, the user preferably clicks on the 'Update' button 86 and then the 'Save' button 87 to permanently save the new information." Furthermore, Yeager discloses in Figure 2 and column 8, lines 27-30 that the hard disk 35 which contains the information of the relational database may be located in the server 34.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states in the third paragraph of page 8 that Yeager does not disclose 'applying commit rule options, during said saving of aid changes of data contained in said worksheet grid, to choose a method by which errors are handled during the processing of database updates, deletes, and inserts."

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. The above limitation is a new limitation introduced by applicant's most recent amending of the claims. Examiner provides new art rejection in view of Helland who discloses above limitation.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant presents the same arguments as discussed above in pages 9-12.

Examiner Responds:

Applicant is referred to above examiner responses.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (703) 305-0620. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436.

Art Unit: 2161

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Etienne LeRoux

2/21/2005

S. M.
SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100